

R E M A R K S

Claims 9 through 17 are in the application, with claims 9-13 and 16-17 having been amended and claims 1-8 and 18-30 having been cancelled. Claims 9 is the independent claim herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0080783 (“Fujimori”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

§112 Rejections

Claim 9 has been amended to remove the phrases “one or more other nodes” and “the node” in the second line of the claim. Withdrawal of the section 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejections

Amended independent claim 9 relates to a node activation method. The method comprises reading an identifier from a shared storage node to determine an identified node, activating the identified node if the identifier indicates that the identified node was previously active, if the identified node was not previously active, then one of a plurality of nodes is selected as active based on an address of the one of the plurality of nodes, and if the one of the plurality of nodes is not indicated by the identifier read from the shared storage node then an identifier is written to the shared storage node where the identifier is associated with the one of the plurality of nodes. The identifier is associated with a chassis management module node. The method further comprises rewriting the identifier of the one of the plurality of nodes to the shared storage node periodically if the identified node is initially active, and selecting the one of the plurality of nodes as active if the identifier of the one of the plurality of nodes remains in the

shared storage node after a predetermined period of time and a last active node has not informed the one of the plurality of nodes that the last active node was active within the predetermined period of time.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest the aforementioned features of amended independent claim 1. In particular, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest selecting one of a plurality of nodes as active if an identifier of the one of the plurality of nodes remains in a shared storage node after a predetermined period of time and a last active node has not informed the one of the plurality of nodes that the last active node was active within the predetermined period of time.

The Office Action states that Fujimori discloses “selecting one of the node and the other nodes as initially active if the node and the other nodes are not indicated by the identifier read from the shared storage node” at [0054]. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Fujimori, at [0054], discloses that a user of a networked node may select a desired node group and thereby determine which node group the user's node should belong to. If a new node group that has never existed before is to be established, a new group establishing mode is activated and a user is prompted to enter a name of the new node group. Once the name of the new node group is entered by the user, the new name is stored into a storage section of the user's node, and the new node group is established. When a new node group is established, only one node belongs to the newly-established node group but the new node group may increase each time a similar predetermined operation is performed in another node for selecting the new node group.

The nodes, as disclosed in [0054] of Fujimori, are selected based on a user selection or a predetermined operation but are not based on a predetermined period of time. Moreover, nowhere does Fujimori disclose or suggest that selection of a node is based on a last active node that was active within the predetermined period of time.

Therefore, nowhere can Fujimori be seen to disclose or to suggest selecting one of a plurality of nodes as active if an identifier of the one of the plurality of nodes remains in a shared storage node after a predetermined period of time and a last active node has not informed the one

of the plurality of nodes that the last active node was active within the predetermined period of time.

In view of the forgoing, amended independent claim 9 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

C O N C L U S I O N

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

September 26, 2008
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/
Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982